Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/065,036	ZHU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tiffany A Fetzner	2859
All Participants:	Status of Application: RCE pending	
(1) <u>Tiffany A Fetzner</u> .	(3)	
(2) Attorney Jean K. Testa Reg. No. 39,396.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 14 September 2004	Time: <u>2:00pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		
Claims discussed: See Continuation Sheet		
Prior art documents discussed: None		• .
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writto ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
•		
·		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature - if appropriate)

Continuation of claims discussed: Restriction/election of species Group 1 claims: 1-6, 8, 27-31; MRI apparatus which forms an image without an extended field-of-view being required. Group 2 cklaims 9-15, 17-26, and 32-39 which are drawn to an MRI method which images an extended field-of-view.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative to request a telephonic election of a restriction in the instant RCE application, because applicant's amended RCE claims are no longer a single invention. Amended independent claim 1 is drawn to an MRI system for imaging, which does not require an extended field-of-view; while Independent claims 9, 18 and their respective dependent claims are drawn to an MRI method where the ability to obtain an extended field-of-view is required. Group 1 and Group 2 are distinct from one another. The applicant's attorney elected Group 2 claims 9-15, 17-26, and 32-39 without traverse..